

REMARKS

This Amendment, submitted in response to the Office Action dated December 1, 2005, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 8-11, 15-19 and 21 are all the claims pending in the application.

I. Preliminary Matter

Applicant notes that the Examiner has not addressed claims 20 and 21. The Applicant's undersigned representative contacted the Examiner on January 10, 2006, to clarify this matter; however, the Examiner requested that comments with respect to non-addressed claims 20 and 21 be addressed in Applicant's next filed response.

Therefore, Applicant submits that in every Office action, each pending claim should be mentioned by number, and its treatment or status given. MPEP 707.07(i). Since the Examiner has not provided grounds for rejecting claims 20 and 21, Applicant requests that the Examiner either allow claims 20 and 21 or the Examiner should issue a new and non-final Office Action addressing claims 20 and 21. MPEP 710.06.

II. Rejection of claims 1, 9-11 and 16-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 9-11 and 16-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fukaya (U.S. Patent No. 4,942,325) in view of Freyman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,979,760). Claim 1 has been amended to recite the subject matter of dependent claim 20. Claim 20 has consequently been canceled.

Applicant submits that the combination of Fukaya and Freyman do not teach the elements of claim 1 as amended. In particular, the references do not even address the composition of their conductor coatings, if any, or the need for a welding layer and insulating layer. Consequently, claim 1 and its dependent claims should be deemed allowable. Claims 18 and 19 have also been amended to include the subject matter of claim 20. Consequently, claims 18 and 19 should also be deemed allowable.

Claim 16

In rejecting claim 16, the Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to use an electromagnetic device in various environments. However, claim 16 recites “a pair of coils opposing each other, wherein said pair of coils are enclosed by the cover member.” Consequently, claim 16 is not directed to the environment in which the electromagnetic device is used. Therefore, claim 16 should be deemed allowable.

III. Rejection of claims 8 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 8 and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fukawa in view of Freyman and further in view of Ghorashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,202,187). Claims 8 and 15 should be deemed allowable by virtue of their dependency on claim 1 for the reasons set forth above. Moreover, Ghorashi does not cure the deficiencies of Fukaya and Freyman.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
Appln. No.: 09/961,273

Attorney Docket No.: Q65705

IV. New Claims

Applicant has added claims 22 and 23 to provide a more varied scope of protection. Claims 22 and 23 should be deemed allowable by virtue of their dependency to claim 1 for the reasons set forth above.

V. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Ruthleen E. Uy
Registration No. 51,361

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: March 1, 2006